

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TREAUNA L. TURNER,

Plaintiff,

v.

PALLARES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:21-cv-01721-BAM (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO  
RANDOMLY ASSIGN DISTRICT JUDGE TO  
ACTION

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO  
DISMISS ACTION, WITHOUT PREJUDICE,  
FOR FAILURE TO OBEY COURT ORDERS  
AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE

(ECF Nos. 8, 10, 12, 17)

**FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE**

**I. Background**

Plaintiff Treauna L. Turner (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On February 17, 2022, the Court screened the complaint and found that Plaintiff stated a cognizable claim against Defendant Showalter for deliberate indifference to medical care in violation of the Eighth Amendment, but failed to state any other cognizable claims for relief against any other defendants. (ECF No. 8.) The Court ordered Plaintiff to file a first amended complaint or to notify the Court in writing that she does not wish to file a first amended complaint and is willing to proceed only on the cognizable claim identified. (*Id.* at 11–12.) The Court

expressly warned Plaintiff that her failure to comply with the Court's order would result in dismissal of this action, without prejudice, for failure to obey a court order and for failure to prosecute. (*Id.* at 12.) Following three extensions of time, the deadline for Plaintiff to file an amended complaint or a notice of her willingness to proceed on the cognizable claims identified has expired, and Plaintiff has failed to respond to the Court's order.

## **II. Failure to Prosecute and Failure to Obey a Court Order**

### **A. Legal Standard**

Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure . . . of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate, . . . dismissal.” *Thompson v. Hous. Auth.*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g., Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130–33 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order).

In determining whether to dismiss an action, the Court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions. *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9th Cir. 1988).

### **B. Discussion**

Here, Plaintiff's amended complaint or notice of willingness to proceed on cognizable claims is overdue, and she has failed to comply with the Court's order. The Court cannot effectively manage its docket if Plaintiff ceases litigating her case. Thus, the Court finds that both the first and second factors weigh in favor of dismissal.

1 The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendant, also weighs in favor of dismissal, since a  
2 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an action.  
3 *Anderson v. Air W.*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor usually weighs against  
4 dismissal because public policy favors disposition on the merits. *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d  
5 639, 643 (9th Cir. 2002). However, “this factor lends little support to a party whose  
6 responsibility it is to move a case toward disposition on the merits but whose conduct impedes  
7 progress in that direction,” which is the case here. *In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products*  
8 *Liability Litigation*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1228 (9th Cir. 2006) (citation omitted).

9 Finally, the Court’s warning to a party that failure to obey the court’s order will result in  
10 dismissal satisfies the “considerations of the alternatives” requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262;  
11 *Malone*, 833 at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court’s February 17, 2022 screening  
12 order expressly warned Plaintiff that failure to comply with the Court’s order would result in a  
13 recommendation of dismissal of this action, without prejudice, for failure to obey a court order  
14 and for failure to prosecute. (ECF No. 8, p. 12.) The Court’s March 4, 2022, May 13, 2022, and  
15 June 27, 2022 orders granting Plaintiff’s motions for extensions of time contained the same  
16 express warning. (ECF Nos. 10, p. 3; 12, p. 3; 17, p. 3.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning  
17 that dismissal could result from her noncompliance.

18 Additionally, at this stage in the proceedings there is little available to the Court that  
19 would constitute a satisfactory lesser sanction while protecting the Court from further  
20 unnecessary expenditure of its scarce resources. Plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis* in this  
21 action, making monetary sanctions of little use, and the preclusion of evidence or witnesses is  
22 likely to have no effect given that Plaintiff has ceased litigating her case.

### 23 **III. Conclusion and Recommendation**

24 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS the Clerk of the Court to randomly assign a  
25 district judge to this action.

26 Further, the Court finds that dismissal is the appropriate sanction and HEREBY  
27 RECOMMENDS that this action be dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to obey a Court  
28 order and for Plaintiff’s failure to prosecute this action.

1           These Findings and Recommendation will be submitted to the United States District Judge  
2 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within **fourteen**  
3 **(14) days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendation, Plaintiff may file written  
4 objections with the Court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s  
5 Findings and Recommendation.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the  
6 specified time may result in the waiver of the “right to challenge the magistrate’s factual  
7 findings” on appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Baxter v.*  
8 *Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

9  
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: September 13, 2022

12 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28